

**Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, July 25, 2007**

I. Announcements

- **John B. Oakley, Academic Council Chair**
- **Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Vice Chair**

Chair Oakley asked Council members to join him in congratulating UCAAD Chair Gibor Basri on his recent appointment as UC Berkeley's new Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion. Professor Basri will begin serving in that capacity as of August 13th. Chair Oakley then called an executive session for discussion of confidential issues.

Vice Chair Brown briefly updated members on the activities of the Study Group on University Diversity. The various subcommittees of the Study Group have been working to develop recommendations for inclusion in its report and are nearing the completion of that effort. A meeting is scheduled for July 31st to review proposed recommendations, which are expected to be forward-thinking and may include endorsement of the faculty Statement on Diversity and a proposed evaluation and monitoring process.

II. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved with the amendment that agenda item XVII, Revised Sexual Harassment Training Module, will be considered after agenda item II.

III. Consent Calendar

- 1. Minutes of the June 27, 2007 meeting**
- 2. Proposed Changes to APMs 710, 711, and 080**
- 3. Self-supporting and Differential Fee Graduate Degree Programs Data Request**
- 4. Mathematics (c) and Laboratory Science (d) Requirements Task Force Nominations**
- 5. Resolution in Honor of Vice President Hershman**

ACTION: The Consent Calendar, with the exception of item #2, was adopted by unanimous consent.

ACTION: The Council will defer action on the proposed changes to APMs 710, 711, and 080 pending possible input from further administrative review. If subsequent changes are made from that review, UCFW will determine whether a further revision should come before Council. If no further changes are made, the Council will send the APMs out for Senate review as noted in the July 25 agenda.

IV. Proposed Academic Council Policy on Fiscal Impact Statements

- **John B. Oakley, Academic Council Chair**
- **Vivek Shetty, Subcommittee Chair**

ISSUE: At its March 28th meeting, the Academic Council discussed the issue of unfunded mandates and the need to have information on the budgetary impact of the proposed policies and programs that the Council is asked to review. A Council subgroup made up of Professors

Mecartney, Newfield, Powell, and Shetty developed a proposed Council policy and a suggested template for statements of fiscal impact, which could accompany proposals submitted for review. The proposed policy statement, as revised at the May 23rd Academic Council meeting, was sent out to divisions and committees for informal comment. Responses from the review included recommendations to develop a full justification for the proposal (including a discussion of the problem and a clear procedural outline), setting a higher “trigger amount” for requiring a statement, and a cost-benefit analysis of the proposal.

DISCUSSION: Division Chair Shetty clarified that the initial intent was to create an internal Academic Council practice to assure the availability and consideration of information on the fiscal impact of proposals that come before the Council. The subgroup thought it would also be helpful to offer a model impact-statement template. The proposed policy and model template were not discussed by Council but were sent out for full Senate review, which elicited a number of detailed recommendations that go beyond the original conception of the proposal. Professor Shetty asked that Council focus on the original intent of the proposal to inform today’s action, noting that the threshold impact amount may be set higher, as recommended, and that the template can simply be passed on to OP as an exemplar. Council Chair Oakley observed that, understood as a mere recommendation of preferred action, the proposal may not have needed full Senate review. Nonetheless, review had been useful in establishing the expectation that OP should provide a fiscal analysis of proposals, and in airing the concerns of reviewing bodies about process and justification. Members generally agreed that proposals coming to the Academic Council having budgetary implications should be accompanied by an estimation of the related fiscal impact.

MOVED: To approve the proposed statement on fiscal impact.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: To amend the statement to read in its entirety: “Whenever practicable, all policies or proposals submitted to the Academic Council should be accompanied by an estimation of fiscal impact.”

ACTION: The Academic Council unanimously adopted the amended statement on fiscal impact as an internal policy. The statement will be included in the Academic Senate’s operating procedures as an internal guide to practice. A memo will be sent to President Dynes informing him of the Council’s action and requesting the administration’s cooperation in providing fiscal impact statements whenever practicable. The 2007-08 Academic Council Chair will report to the Council next year on how the policy is working and whether a standardized template or other procedural changes are needed.

V. CCGA and UCEP Proposal: “The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction”

- **Reen Wu, CCGA Chair**
- **Richard Weiss, UCEP Chair**

ISSUE: In 2005-2006, CCGA and UCEP developed a joint report on the appropriate degree and manner of the use of graduate students in instruction at UC. Based on the responses received from a systemwide review, the Academic Council did not endorse the report and its recommendations as written. CCGA and UCEP have now submitted a revised version of the report for Council’s consideration.

DISCUSSION: Professor Wu, while noting that this is an important area of Senate concern, requested Council’s endorsement of the revised proposal without further review. Professor Weiss

stated he also hopes this version would be adopted and that CCGA and UCEP tried to respond constructively to input received from the review by providing, in this revision, maximum flexibility while still maintaining that graduate students are in training and need supervision.

Chair Oakley noted that the June 21st submittal letter he had received from CCGA and UCEP indicated that the proposal had been “approved [by these committees] for review by the full Academic Senate,” and reminded members that the proposal also entails amendments to the Senate regulations as well as an APM change. One member suggested a technical change to the second sentence in the proposed amended APM 750.B, changing “by the Committee on Courses” to read: “by the divisional committee on courses” in order to include campuses that may not have a formal Committee on Courses. This change was accepted by Professors Wu and Weiss. Council members were divided on the question of whether the proposal should be sent out for another round of review, some members finding this version adequately addressed initial concerns, and others seeing the benefit of further deliberation. One member suggested that the proposal can also serve as an opportunity to present UC’s research mission in a positive light by emphasizing the integration of research and instruction.

ACTION: The Academic Council voted 8 in favor, 6 opposed, with 3 abstentions, to send out for systemwide review, with an accepted technical change, the revised CCGA and UCEP proposal “The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction.”

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers

- **Robert C. Dynes, President**
- **Wyatt R. Hume, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic and Health Affairs**
- **Katherine N. Lapp, Executive Vice President, Business Operations**
- **Larry Hershman, Vice President, Budget**

President Dynes

UC organizational review. A major organizational review is underway involving a look at the roles of and relationships between and among the Office of the President, The Regents, and the campuses. In a revision of a recent communication on this effort, it has been clarified that neither the role of the Academic Senate in university governance nor shared governance at UC is under scrutiny in this review.

Transitions in campus administration. Bob Gray has been appointed Acting Chancellor of the Riverside campus. He knows UCR and the Riverside community well, and will be an effective interim leader. Norm Abrams, the outgoing Acting Chancellor at UCLA, performed brilliantly in that capacity by dealing progressively with some very difficult issues. The search for the UCSC chancellor is at the interview stage, and the search effort is just now being mounted for a Riverside Chancellor.

The state budget. The Assembly passed a budget last week, and it is now being debated in the Senate. UC launched an advocacy campaign aimed at getting Republican support for the Assembly budget, which provides UC with the 4% increase provided in the Compact and with funding for some additional programs and initiatives. It does not include the requested support for the Cal ISIs or the peta-scale computer program.

Funding from the tobacco industry. An agreement may still be reached on the question of accepting tobacco industry funding that honors the integrity of the faculty and recognizes the self-

governance of UC faculty. A compromise solution is being worked on involving conflict-of-interest and self-reporting processes that are in place, and it is hoped that further confrontation can be avoided by a solution that is based in the faculty's established role of responsibility vis-à-vis their own research.

Campus visits. Recent visits were made to Riverside, San Diego, and Irvine. Although each campus has unique needs and responses, there is a general enthusiasm for the vision of UC as the "power of 10" that will build strengths individually and collectively. Visits to the Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Berkeley campuses are slated for the fall.

Vice President Hershman

The State Budget. The budget under consideration is quite conservative, and it is a big victory that UC was able to hold onto funding for COLAs. The Department of Finance does want to honor the terms of the Compact. Assuming this budget is approved, UC will ask for the Governor's veto of control language that blocks price-increase funding for the 08-09 year. Also, UC will need to work on proposing legislation that will put funding back in the budget for the Cal ISIs and the peta-scale computer, once the Assembly reconvenes later in August. The current Republican-plan cuts are mostly to social services, which the Democrats will not pass, so further negotiations are expected. The proposed cuts did not include UC COLAs or funding for academic preparation, but did include labor-research funding, an augmentation for the Scripps Institute, and \$7 million that is mistakenly listed as funding for a facility in Mexico but is actually funding that allows UC to pay debt service.

Provost Hume

Faculty salaries. The basic plan to reform the faculty salary scale and bring faculty salaries up to market levels was presented at this month's Regents' meeting. The presentation's primary focus was on the importance of maintaining the integrity of a rigorous post-tenure review and merit-based system; the need for competitive salary levels was a secondary argument. The Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales will reconvene soon to focus on draft revised scales that can be brought to the Regents in September. The challenges to the plan are: 1) state funding levels and other sources for funding; 2) the question of equity with staff, which compounds the financial challenge; and 3) receiving full support from the chancellors.

Professional degree fees. Discussion of differential fees for professional schools at the Regents' meeting focused on what the right level of fees should be and what the impact of increased fees on diversity will be. To adequately address these issues, responses from the professional school deans will be solicited in order to engage The Regents in a value-defining discussion. It is hoped that a moderate proposal can be adopted that will maintain the quality of the professional programs and be done over a multi-year time frame. Undergraduate fees are being kept separate from this discussion.

Admissions. Vice President Sakaki presented a report to the Regents, noting that admissions are more open now than in the past. Raising the required GPA to 3.0 did not make much difference in admissions numbers; the report did, however, show a narrow band of low GPA and SAT data. As part of a commitment to providing full and open information, UCOP will be posting admissions data on the website dating back to 1992.

Funding from the tobacco industry. The compromise that is being developed by the Provost will start with a statement of disapproval of the tobacco industry and a statement of trust in the self-regulation of UC faculty and its tradition of reviewing the academic merit of research proposals. If

a draft is agreed on, it will be given to the Regents as information in September and forwarded to the Senate to allow time for a full review.

The educational imperative. UC is obligated to address inequities at all levels of education, and should do so for its own benefit as well. UC will be broadening its partnership with other higher education segments, with K-12, and with the government, not only to elevate the value of existing programs, but also to bring in scholars from outside the education discipline, create cross-disciplinary partnerships, and leverage other resources. Our existing programs are very good, but UC must do more in partnership with others to meet this obligation.

Academic planning. We are in the last stage of planning discussions with the campuses. EVP Lapp will be participating in this round, which is intended to further promote openness among the campuses with respect to their academic planning.

EVC Lapp

Budget development. As Provost Hume mentioned, EVP Lapp will be participating in visits to the campuses and, relating to the budget process, will be hearing what their needs are and getting their input on the budget development process. The recent presentation made to The Regents on next year's budget was very general. A more detailed presentation will be offered in September that will look at priorities and possible budgetary trade-offs. The Regents issued a statement to the Legislature decrying possible severe cuts to the UC budget and stressing the critical role UC plays in the state's culture and economy.

Other. Negotiations are ongoing with the unions on the issue of the restart of contributions to the pension fund. There are no new details on the organizational review of UC being led by the Monitor Group because the steering committee meeting rescheduled for this week was cancelled.

Discussion / Q and A

Tobacco funding

Comment: The proposed compromise on tobacco funding would entail large logistical and other efforts at the campus level to make it work. Currently, conflict of interest committees are in no position to take this on. In addition, this plan would be complicated to oversee.

Q: Is consideration being given to including other funding sources in the compromise?

A (Provost Hume): That is a possibility. Alternatively, other funders could be added later, but what would the trigger be? Racketeering?

Q: Basing this new plan on a "review of scientific merit" doesn't seem practical and has many implications. Will this be done at the systemwide or campus level? How will it be done in a timely fashion? This sort of review is usually one of risk-benefit, not scientific merit. Also, the Senate review time frame needs to be worked with.

A (Provost Hume): Review procedures are in place, and it was thought that scientific review would be the best basis, since the main concerns related to tobacco funding are not conflict of interest concerns.

Comment: The Davis Division wanted to go in the direction of more regulation of the industry, which would better enable a focus on the issue of misrepresentation of research and university information.

Faculty salaries

Q: Will the plan to resume contributions to UCRP complicate the effort to increase faculty salaries?

A (EVP Lapp): It will be helpful to have an appropriate, agreed-upon triggering mechanism for the restart of contributions. The two state funds are doing very well; and CalPERS is not stopping contributions. (VP Hershman): The Compact has a provision for contributions from the state; therefore, contributions should not constitute an added obligation for UC. The real problem is that the legislature does not view contributions as being necessary until UCRP's funding is below 100%.

Q: How much money should campuses stockpile to make this plan work? Not knowing an amount but still feeling the need to put funds aside is affecting present recruitment efforts.

A (VP Hershman): The campuses will have to put some money into the plan. Although it is not certain how much at this point, it may not be as much as is feared. UCOP will look at what campuses are spending on salaries anyway. It is expected that a combination of revenues from all available sources will make the plan work.

Comment: When the salary-scale change and the raises are effective, UCOP should be proactive in informing the public and the faculty. This could include an op-ed piece and articles in campus newsletters.

Professional school fees

Comment: The notion of differential fees raises concerns besides diversity – for example maintaining the public nature of UC, or the influence of funders on programs. This change should be experimental and should be closely evaluated, and it should be clear who will make those decisions and on what basis the amounts will be decided.

Response (Provost Hume): The Regents should have guidelines, but they have not delegated development of such to OP. Monitoring the increases should include also charting their impact on diversity and on capital programs. (VP Hershman): I agree this can have an impact on state funding. There is a huge danger in going too far with differential fees. When differences are allowed, some campus proposals might lead the public to feel that UC needs less state money. This concern has been indicated to The Regents.

Q: This is an ad hoc solution that perpetuates a drift towards a policy that can affect undergraduate fees as well and cause more differentiation among campuses. Why isn't there a reasoned principle that ensures non-application to undergraduate fees?

A (Provost Hume): The need to safeguard undergraduate fees is addressed in the statement that affirms a commitment to non-differential fees for undergraduate and academic graduate students.

Other

Q: Is the newly created CFO position still necessary? What would that officer do at this point?

A: (President Dynes): The CFO would overlook the global financial state of the university, but not the budget. Right now, the need to fill the position is being examined.

Q: Why was there no outcry about the misunderstanding of the terms of the labs contracts [that, with extensions, they may involve a 20-year rather than a 7-year commitment]? Is it really the case that UC can exit the contract if necessary?

A (President Dynes): Because the DOE would not want a reluctant partner, UC would be able to negotiate a release from the contract.

Q: UCRP has had some bad press recently. Are the unions still saying the pension funds are mismanaged?

A (VP Hershman): Part of that comes from the unions' desire to have UCRP contributions covered by salary increases. The real problem is getting everyone to agree on a phasing plan. The unions

are serious about having a voice in governance, and a workable compromise may be to offer them more participation in an advisory capacity.

ACTION: The Academic Council presented the following resolution to Vice President Hershman, upon his retirement, in honor of his years of service to the University and to the Academic Senate:

The Academic Council expresses its respect, affection, and gratitude to Larry Hershman for his exceptional stewardship as UC's Budget Director since 1978 and Vice President for Budget since 1998 and for his unfailing support of the Academic Senate, shared governance, and the excellence of the University of California throughout his 39 years of dedicated and unselfish University service.

VII. General Discussion

Members aired continuing questions about the support that will be needed from campuses and from other sources to realize the faculty-salary plan as presented by the administration. Members of the Faculty Salary Task Force clarified that the full fiscal impact for each campus will not be known until all files are reviewed, and that there will be differential contributions from campuses, since some will need to spend more than others to raise salaries to market levels. It was also noted that Chancellors will likely support the plan because they can, in only two years, break even or perhaps be ahead through retaining faculty rather than having to replace them. Council members expressed a strong interest in knowing more specifics about the planned changes to the salary scale as well as how the raises will be funded and the related impact on each of the campuses.

Action: Chair Oakley will attempt to arrange a briefing of Council members on the proposal of the Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales before the end of the business year. At that time, he hopes to have a beta version of the proposal for a revised faculty-salary scale and salary increases ready for Council members' review.

VIII. Request of the UC Committee on Latino Research (UCCLR) to change its Status to that of a Multi-campus Research Unit

ISSUE: Last year, in accord with the terms of the Compendium (the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units), CCGA, UCORP, and UCPB submitted formal comments on the 15-year review of UCCLR. Due to diverging recommendations among the committees, the Council, in July 2006, requested further information from UCCLR before offering its final response to the Vice Provost for Research. These committees have now reviewed a supplemental submission from UCCLR which, in response to comments from UCORP and UCPB, proposes a three-year funding plan for changing UCCLR to a Multi-campus Research Unit. UCORP endorsed the plan with reservations about whether the requested funding would be available. CCGA did not oppose the plan, but did not find a compelling reason to fund UCCLR over other MRU requests for support. UCPB advised that UCCLR should submit its request in coordination with the Office Research's newly instituted competitive funding processes, and that UCCLR receive continued support for one year in order to develop such a proposal.

DISCUSSION: Council members asked for clarification regarding the origin of the UCCLR request and the scope of the Senate’s role in MRU reviews and establishing MRUs.

ACTION: Council deferred immediate action on this item pending clarification of the nature of UCCLR’s request and of the history of the issue. Vice Chair Brown will provide those clarifications and a revised draft response, which will be circulated by e-mail for approval.

IX. UCFW Issues

▪ Susan French, UCFW Chair

1. Proposed Statement on UCRP

ISSUE: A subgroup of UCFW and TFIR members have drafted the enclosed statement on UCRP, in response to concerns expressed by some members of the UC faculty and the UC community at large, about the recent management and investment performance of UCRP. UCFW requests that Council endorse this statement, for communication to the President, The Regents, UC faculty members, and other interested members of the UC community.

REPORT: The statement provides information on how the funding of the plan is calculated and why it should stay at 100%. It also addresses criticisms relating to the investment of pension funds, showing that UCRP’s performance over time is the same as CalPERS. UCFW is asking the Academic Council to endorse the statement and use it to make public these points: 1) that there is no reason to worry about UCRP’s investment performance; 2) that contributions to the plan should be resumed; and 3) that it is advisable for The Regents to retain control of the investment of funds and to work to obtain an exception to the labor relations act (HEERA) allowing the advisory board to again make recommendations directly The Regents.

DISCUSSION: Members applauded the work of TFIR and UCFW, and generally supported the proposed UCFW statement. Several language changes were adopted to add clarity and to make the tone more neutral.

ACTION: By unanimous consent, the Academic Council adopted the Proposed Academic Council Statement on UCRP as amended on the floor.

2. Update on Mercer’s Total Remuneration Report: an end-of-the year-update on UCFW’s progress in evaluating the report and achieving revisions.

REPORT: Most of the problems UCFW identified with the Mercer report have been resolved. There had been serious divergences of approach on the valuation of the differences between defined contribution and defined benefit plans. It is agreed that UCFW will be able to see any new material in the report before it goes out to The Regents. For the present, the valuation of benefits will not be included in Mercer’s calculation of compensation, just cash. The issue of how to calculate benefits will be renewed for discussion next year.

X. APM 620 – Policy on Off-Scale Salaries

ISSUE: The Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales has proposed amendments to APM 620 that would: 1) remove language declaring that off-scale salaries are exceptional; and 2) change language defining salary scales so that the on-scale range of salaries for a particular step includes the entire

range of salaries between the bottom of that step and the bottom of the next higher step. Responses from the systemwide review have been received, many of which expressed concern about the lack of a justification for the proposed changes and the need for the elimination of “exceptional” language in the APM to be bifurcated from implementation of a revised salary scale.

ACTION: Council agreed to forward all comments to the President’s Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales, requesting that revised language amending APM 620 be drafted that retains off-scale decisions as exceptional within the context of the new scale, and that will be accompanied by a full justification of the proposed changes and coordinated with a full proposal for the planned salary increases and scale reform (indicating funding sources).

XI. Lab management Updates

▪ John Oakley, Academic Council and ACSCOLI Chair

Regents Update:

- EVP Bruce Darling and Dr. William Frazer, members of the LANS LLC Board of Governors, have now also been appointed to the LLNS LLC Board.
- An emerging labs issue concerns the lack of parity between the rich retirement package the DOE offered Los Alamos employees who elected to stay on at that lab, and the less valuable package that is being offered to Lawrence Livermore employees.
- The Regents acted to modify the prime contract between the DOE and LBNL, making it easier for the lab to qualify for an award term extension. In a related discussion, the terms of the prime contracts for the LANS and LLNS LLCs were reviewed and The Regents were informed of the nature and potential duration of the term of the prime contracts. The President opined that there are avenues by which to modify UC’s contractual obligations if necessary.

Planned Guide to Labs Contracts:

The effort to create an explanatory guide to the lab-management LLC operating agreements and the prime contracts between the DOE and the LLCs is in a late stage of preparation and should be out soon. The document is being created in close consultation with University Counsel Bill Eklund of the Office of General Counsel.

Update on activities of Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) and Lab Fee Allocation Priorities:

Due to the difficulty of assembling a quorum in mid-summer, ACSCOLI has not held a meeting yet. Therefore, in order to meet today’s deadline for submitting lab fee priorities, the Council is asked to endorse the enclosed recommendations. This proposed response is based on the Council’s previous resolution recommending an eclectic approach to fee allocation for research. The labs operate on a fiscal year ending on September 30, and fees from the previous year’s operations will be awarded in late December or early January. Commitments for the fees are made before the money is available, so it is important for the Council to offer timely advice. At present, the fee-money on the table derives from a fixed fee awarded to LANS LLC for operating LANL for the last four months of FY 2006. The full year of LANS management fees for FY 06-07 will be awarded by DOE late this year.

ACTION: By unanimous consent, the Academic Council approved the proposed response to President Dynes outlining priorities for the allocation of lab-management fees.

XII. Proposed “Governance Work Team” Principles for Policy Setting and Compensation Governance

ISSUE: These guiding principles were prepared by the Governance Work Team assembled by UCOP at the direction of The Regents, and are intended to provide the fundamental bases for setting compensation policies that apply to the Senior Management Group (SMG). At its June 27th meeting, the Academic Council requested that UCAP and UCFW review the documents and provide the Council with recommendations. UCFW has submitted a set of recommended changes to the document that are intended more adequately to recognize the role of the Academic Senate in policy-setting and compensation governance. UCFW also suggested several editorial changes. UCAP has not been able to comment formally on the proposal.

DISCUSSION: UCAP Chair Croughan reported that UCAP had not as a body reviewed the UCFW recommendations, but that she as an individual supported them.

ACTION: By unanimous consent the Academic Council endorsed UCFW’s recommendations to be forwarded to the President with a request that the recommended changes be made to the proposed Principles for Policy Setting and Compensation Governance.

XIII. Recharge of Faculty Salaries to Grants

ISSUE: At the September 2006 meeting of the Academic Council, UCD Division Chair Bisson raised the issue of recharging a portion of faculty salaries to grants, a practice that has been adopted on the Davis campus and which was tried on a trial basis on the Berkeley campus. Faculty members who participate have their professorial appointments reduced by the percentages that they are paid from their grants, and because of this, appear on paper to be non-Senate, part-time appointees. Concerns are that the administration has not offered adequate assurance that faculty will still be treated as full-time faculty, with no impact on benefits or advancement. At its April 25th meeting, the Academic Council discussed the issue briefly and agreed to refer the issue to UCAP and UCPB with a request that these committees submit a response by the July 2007 Academic Council meeting. UCPB and UCAP have now submitted their report.

DISCUSSION: Division Chair Bisson reported that these concerns are ongoing at Davis and that many faculty who opted for this program were not aware that their titles would change, and, as a result, that they would appear not to have security of employment. This could be prejudicial when applying for a loan, and in other circumstances. The Davis administration was asked to provide statements of assurance for each case that would guarantee a return to a 100% position if grant funding ends and assure no negative impacts relating to sabbatical accumulation, benefits, and advancement. She said the UCPB and UCAP comments should be effective support in reiterating that request.

ACTION: Council shall forward UCAP’s and UCPB’s comments to Davis Division Chair Bisson for reference in further communication on this issue between the Davis Division and the UCD campus administration. Council shall also send these comments to Provost Hume for consideration and will continue to monitor related developments.

XIV. University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) Issues

ACTION: The UCAF items were deferred to the next regular meeting of the Academic Council.

XV. Stewardship Review - Executive Session

ISSUE: At June 27th meeting, Academic Council discussed the stewardship review process for UC Senior Management. Council requested that Council Chair Oakley work with Vice Chair Brown and UCAP Chair Croughan to create an action plan for the consideration of this topic for the July Council meeting.

ACTION: The Academic Council agreed to defer to next year further development of a proposed policy on periodic stewardship review, which can build on the outcome of the current effort to determine performance standards for senior managers.

XVI. End of Year Wrap Up

This item was not addressed due to lack of time. (It will be addressed by Chair Oakley in a forthcoming issue of The Senate Source.)

XVII. Revised Sexual Harassment Training Module

▪ **Faye Crosby, UCSC Divisional Chair**

ISSUE: At the June academic Council meeting, Division Chair Crosby volunteered to review and draft changes to the UCOP revised Faculty Sexual Harassment training module. In order for UC to be in compliance with federal regulations, all identified faculty supervisors are required to complete the training by December 30, 2007. UCOP has requested the Senate's input on and endorsement of the module by September 1, 2007.

REPORT: Professor Crosby recommended that the Council endorse the revised training module as amended. She noted that although great improvements have been made to this version, there are still areas in need of improvement, for example, offering better guidance on when or under what circumstances to report to a Title IX officer. This version should provide a starting for the next round of revisions, which, it is hoped, will be done with the input of internal UC experts in related areas.

ACTION: Council members authorized Chair Oakley to forward to President Dynes the recommended revisions of Professor Crosby to the current version of the training module, and to note that the Council wishes to offer continuing input on future versions.

ACTION: Members Crosby and Mecartney were appointed to act as Council liaisons on this issue, and, as such, will monitor the evolution of the next version of the training module and report back on developments to next year's Academic Council.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: John B. Oakley, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst